

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 – 13 and 15 – 18 are now pending in the application. Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 16 – 18 have been added for substantive examination. Minor amendments have been made to claims 1 and 4 to simply overcome the objections to the claims as identified by the Examiner. Minor amendments have also been made to claims 3 – 8 and 10 – 13 to correct minor deficiencies. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Figure 1. The attached sheet replaces the original sheet including Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

SPECIFICATION

The disclosure stands objected to because of the following informalities:

(1) Reference numeral 32 used in paragraph [0037]. Applicants have amended paragraph [0037] according to the Examiners instruction. Specifically, “vehicle 32” has been amended to recite “vehicle 12”.

(2) Proper antecedent basis was not provided for the claimed language “the output end of a cable removably connected to the audio generating component” as specified in claim 1. Applicants have amended paragraph [0027] to provide proper antecedent basis for this language. Applicants note that the amended language provided in paragraph [0027] simply reflects the terms included in the claims as originally filed and also provided in the drawings as originally filed (see. e.g. Fig. 1). As a result, no new matter has been entered.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1 – 8 stand objected to because of the following informalities. Specifically, recitation of the phrase “the audio broadcast signal” has been corrected in claims 1 and 4 according to the Examiners instruction.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9 – 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,361,305 (Easley). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that independent claims 9 and 15 have been amended. More specifically, claim 9 has been amended to recite outputting the audio signal to at least two speakers; outputting the audio signal from the at least two speakers concurrently; and detecting the audio signal from the at least two speakers.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite outputting the audio broadcast signal to at least two speakers; outputting the audio signal from the at least two speakers concurrently and defining a concurrent audio output; detecting the concurrent audio output at the microphone and generating a microphone output signal; inputting the microphone output signal and the radio broadcast signal into a digital signal processor; producing a single waveform that represents the concurrent audio output; and analyzing the single waveform.

Applicants respectfully assert that Easley does not teach or suggest outputting the audio signal from the at least two speakers concurrently.

As best understood by the Applicants, Easley discloses an automotive testing method for verifying installation and functioning of an audio system in a vehicle. The testing method of Easley provides sequential testing of individual speakers according to attributed frequency. More specifically, the test is run for a system having woofers and tweeters and thus employs midrange and high frequencies. “First each speaker location is tested at the midrange tone and the tests are repeated for the high tone”. See Column 4, Lines 15 – 17. Further, the tone frequency is set to 1kHz for a midrange test. Once it has been determined that there was no failed speaker, the test sequence is repeated for a high tone. The tone frequency is set to 5 kHz for the high tone.

The system and method in the present invention is distinct from Easley. The instant invention, as claimed, outputs at least two concurrent audio signals from at least

two speakers, respectively. As set forth in paragraph [0039] and depicted in FIGS. 3 – 5, the instant invention operates two speakers concurrently (such as tweeter 68 and midrange 70). The system and method according to the instant invention determines a graphical impulse response if one speaker is disconnected (such as tweeter 68 disconnected, FIG. 4; or midrange 70 disconnected, FIG. 5). As a result, the present invention is able to analyze a single waveform representing multiple speakers. From the waveform, decisions may be made regarding operation of each speaker. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 and 15 are in condition for allowance. As a result, dependant claims 10 – 13 and 16 – 18 are likewise in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley in view of US Patent No. 4,881,910 (Odemer). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that independent claim 1 has been amended. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite at least two audio speakers whereby the audio generating component receives the audio broadcast signal from the output end of the cable and outputs the received signal to the at least two audio speakers and wherein each of the at least two audio speakers outputs the received signal and emits at least two concurrent audio signals, respectively.

As explained above, Easley does not include, at least two audio speakers that output the received signal and collectively emit at least two concurrent audio signals. Odemer at best discloses a quick release removal device for removing radio components from a dash board. Specifically a shuttle 11 is designed to permit an owner removal of a unit 10 located in a dashboard console 20. When an owner has concern for possible theft, he inserts a dummy tape cassette 40 into the tape opening, pulls on a handle 41 and the entire radio 10 exits the shuttle. Odemer, alone or in combination with Easley, does not include at least two audio speakers that output the received signal and collectively emit at least two concurrent audio signals.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. As a result, dependant claims 3 – 8 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If for some reason a fee needs to be paid please charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for the fees, which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2.25.05

By: 

Christopher DeVries
Reg. No. 44,654
313-665-4969

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION.
Legal Staff
Mail Code 482-C23-B21
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000
(313) 665--4969